

REMARKS

Reconsideration of all grounds of rejection in the Office Action based upon the following amendments, and allowance of all of the pending claims are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-13 are rejected. Claims 1-5 and 12 were amended. Claims 1-18 are now pending.

New claims 14-18 were added. Support for the new claims are found in the specification and drawings (FIGs. 3 & 4, page 14, line 9 to 22 to page 15, line 16). No new matter was added.

Claim 12 stands objected to because of informalities. In response, applicants have corrected the spelling error found in the dependent claim. Therefore, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In response, applicants have made the change to the claims suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Darcie et al. (US 5,559,624).

Claim 1, as amended now recites a wavelength-division-multiplexed passive optical network comprising, inter alia, “a central office in which a multi-wavelength lasing source is located, **said multi-wavelength lasing source having a**

multiplexing/demultiplexing unit and a plurality of reflectors coupled the multiplexing/demultiplexing unit...”

In contrast, Darcie, as illustrated in FIG. 1, disclose a central office comprising a CO Processor 15, a Sequencer 30, a Frequency Tunable Optical Transmitter 20, and an Optical receiver 40. Darcie’s central office fails to disclose **a multi-wavelength lasing source having a multiplexing/demultiplexing unit and a plurality of reflectors coupled the multiplexing/demultiplexing unit,** as recited in the base claim.

As Darcie fails to anticipate the present invention as explained above, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

Claims 1 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (US 5,930,015) in view of Frigo et al. (wavelength-division multiplexed passive optical network with cost-shared components”).

Yamamoto, as read by applicants discloses an optical access system as illustrated in FIG. 24 an optical transmitter 222 which transmits an optical signal and a first optical coupler-splitters 223 equipped with a function of coupling optical signals of nodes. Yamamoto does not disclose a central office nor a central office including, *inter alia*, **a multi-wavelength lasing source having a multiplexing/demultiplexing unit and a plurality of reflectors coupled the multiplexing/demultiplexing unit,** as recited in the base claim.

Further, Frigo, discloses in FIG. 1, a wavelength-division multiplexed passive optical network comprising a central office **a remote node** including *a wavelength-division multiplexing router* and an ONU with modulators instead of lasers. Hence, Frigo

does not disclose a central office including, *inter alia*, **a multi-wavelength lasing source having a multiplexing/demultiplexing unit and a plurality of reflectors coupled the multiplexing/demultiplexing unit**, as recited in the base claim.

Accordingly, none of the features incorporated into the base claims are suggested or taught by Yamamoto or in combination with Frigo. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claim discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited reference. A notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that there are any issues, which may be best, resolved by telephone communication, please contact Applicant's undersigned Attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Cha
Registration No. 44,069



Date: January 11, 2007

By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Mail all correspondence to:

Steve Cha, Registration No. 44,069
Cha & Reiter
210 Route 4 East, #103
Paramus, NJ 07652
Tel: 201-226-9245

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on January 11, 2007.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069
(Name of Registered Rep.)


(Signature and Date)